1	NEVIN M. GEWERTZ			
2	ABBY M. MOLLEN BARTLIT BECK HERMAN PALENCHAR			
3	& SCOTT LLP 54 West Hubbard Street, Suite 300			
4	Chicago, IL 60654 Telephone: (312) 494-4400			
5	Facsimile: (312) 494-4440			
6	Attorneys for <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> CONSTITUTIONAL LAW SCHOLARS AND			
7	AMICI CURIAE PROFESSORS OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW,			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
11	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA,	G		
12	Plaintiff,	Case No. 17-cv-00574-WHO		
13	V.			
14	DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, JOHN F. KELLY,	NOTICE OF MOTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION OF		
15	in his official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland	CONSTITUTIONAL LAW SCHOLARS AND PROFESSORS OF		
16	Security, JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the	CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, AND		
	United States, JOHN MICHAEL "MICK" MULVANEY, in his official capacity as	IMMIGRATION LAW FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> BRIEF IN		
18	Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and DOES 1-50,	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'		
19	Defendants.	MOTION TO DISMISS		
20				
	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	Date: July 12, 2017 Time: 2:00 pm		
21	FRANCISCO,	Dep't: Courtroom 2		
22	Plaintiff, vs.	Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick		
23	DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the	Date Filed: February 23, 2017		
24	United States, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JOHN F. KELLY, Secretary of	Trial Date: April 23, 2018		
25	United States Department of Homeland Security, JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III,			
26	Attorney General of the United States, DOES 1-100,	Case No. 3:17-cv-00485-WHO		
27	Defendants.			
28				

1	TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
2	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Raquel Aldana, Michelle Wilde Anderson, W. David
3	Ball, Lenni B. Benson, Gabriel J. Chin, William H.D. Fernholz, Katherine J. Florey, Gerald E.
4	Frug, Bill Ong Hing, Alison L. LaCroix, Sanford V. Levinson, Hiroshi Motomura, James Gray
5	Pope, Darien Shanske, Elissa Steglich, Michael Vitiello, Keith Whittington, Roxana Bacon, Alan
6	Brownstein, Erwin Chemerinsky, David S. Cohen, Seth Davis, Aziz Huq, M. Isabel Medina,
7	Keramet Reiter, Ozan Varol, and Deborah M. Weissman hereby move the Court for leave to file
8	an amicus brief in the above-captioned case in support of Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants'
9	motion to dismiss. Defendants take no position on the request. A copy of the proposed amicus
10	brief is appended as an exhibit to this motion.
11	I. STANDARD FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
12	The Court has broad discretion to permit third parties to participate in an action as amici
13	curiae. Gerritsen v. de la Madrid Hurtado, 819 F.2d 1511, 1514 n.3 (9th Cir. 1987); Woodfin
14	Suite Hotels, LLC v. City of Emeryville, No. C 06-1254 SBA, 2007 WL 81911, at *3 (N.D. Cal.
15	Jan. 9, 2007). Participation of amici curiae may be particularly appropriate where legal issues in a
16	case have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or where amici can offer a
17	unique perspective to aid the Court. Sonoma Falls Dev., LLC v. Nev. Gold & Casinos, Inc., 272 F.
18	Supp. 2d 919, 925 (N.D. Cal. 2003).
19	II. STATEMENT OF IDENTITY OF AMICI CURIAE
20	Amici are among the legal scholars who previously filed separate amicus briefs in support
21	of Plaintiffs at the preliminary injunction stage. Amici Constitutional Law Scholars submitted an
22	amicus brief detailing the potential assault that Executive Order No. 13,768 (January 30, 2017)
23	(the "Executive Order" or "Order") makes on Our Federalism. See D.I. 69.* Amici Professors of
24	Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Immigration Law submitted an amicus brief
25	
26	* All docket numbers refer to the docket numbers in case number 3:17-cv-00485-WHO.
27	

I	detailing the Separation of Powers problems presented by the Order. D.I. 68. Amici wish to offer	
2	their expertise regarding the principles that inform whether Executive Order No. 13,768, 82 Fed.	
3	Reg. 8799 (Jan. 25, 2017) (the "Executive Order" or the "Order") is constitutional.	
4	Amici Constitutional Law Scholars are (all institutional affiliations are for identification	
5	purposes only):	
6	Raquel Aldana, McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific	
7	Michelle Wilde Anderson, Stanford Law School	
8	W. David Ball, Santa Clara School of Law	
9	Lenni B. Benson, New York Law School	
10	Gabriel J. Chin, University of California, Davis School of Law	
11	William H.D. Fernholz, University of California Berkeley School of Law	
12	Katherine J. Florey, University of California Davis School of Law	
13	Gerald E. Frug, Harvard Law School	
14	Bill Ong Hing, University of San Francisco School of Law	
15	Alison L. LaCroix, University of Chicago Law School	
16	Sanford V. Levinson, University of Texas School of Law	
17	Hiroshi Motomura, University of California Los Angeles School of Law	
18	James Gray Pope, Rutgers Law School	
19	Darien Shanske, University of California Davis School of Law	
20	Elissa Steglich, University of Texas School of Law	
21	Michael Vitiello, McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific	
22	Keith Whittington, Princeton University	
23	Amici Professors of Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Immigration Law are	
24	(all institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only):	
25	Roxana Bacon, University of Miami School of Law	
26	Alan Brownstein, University of California at Davis School of Law	
27		

1	Erwin Chemerinsky, University of California, Irvine School of Law		
2	David S. Cohen, Thomas R. Kline School of Law, Drexel University		
3	Seth Davis, University of California, Irvine School of Law		
4	Aziz Huq, University of Chicago Law School		
5	M. Isabel Medina, Loyola University of New Orleans		
6	Keramet Reiter, University of California Irvine School of Social Ecology		
7	Ozan Varol, Associate Professor of Law, Lewis & Clark Law School		
8	Deborah M. Weissman, University of North Carolina School of Law		
9	III. AMICI CURIAE'S EXPERTISE WILL BENEFIT THIS COURT		
10	Due to the constitutional law issues presented by the Executive Order, Amici believe that		
11	their expertise will benefit the Court. In particular, Amici wish to offer their expertise regarding		
12	the Supreme Court's jurisprudence on the Separation of Powers and the limits of the Federal		
13	Government's authority to force State and local governments to administer federal law. Amici		
14	believe that their expertise may be of particular use to the Court given the role Federalism and the		
15	Separation of Powers play as a structural protection of individual liberty and political		
16	accountability and thus, by extension, the potential ramifications that the issues before the Court		
17	may have beyond the parties to the cases. Accordingly, Amici respectfully offer their analysis of		
18	these issues to assist the Court in its deliberations.		
19	CONCLUSION		
20	For the foregoing reasons, the above-listed amici respectfully request this Court's leave to		
21	submit the attached Amicus Curiae brief.		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
20	3		

1	June 28, 2017 BARTLIT BECK HERMAN	I PALENCHAR
2	& SCOTT LLP	
3		
4	By: /s/ Nevin M. Gewertz	
5	Abby M. Mallon*	
6		•
7	Constitutional Law Scho	
,	Curiae Professors of Co	
8		Immigration Law
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	21	
22	22	
23	23	
24	Admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Northern Dis	trict of Illinois.
25	<ul> <li>Admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Northern District Counsel understand that the Court's prior orders waiving <i>pro hac vice</i> required counsel submitting amicus briefs at the preliminary injunction stage rema D.I. 40 (Order Regarding Amicus Briefs) (waiving the <i>pro hac vice</i> required District of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice and the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys at the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys at the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys at the court of California Local Rule 11-3 for att</li></ul>	ins in effect. See
26	District of California Local Rule 11-3 for attorneys admitted to practice as in any United States District Court).	nd in good standing
27	21	
28	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW SCHOL	ARS